

huge tax breaks that some on the other side supported for the largest multinational corporations on Earth, that were promised to create jobs, did the opposite. Two years ago, according to the newspaper, when companies received a big tax break to bring home their offshore profits, the President and Congress justified it as a one-time tax amnesty that would create American jobs, but the companies did not create many jobs in return. Instead, since 2005, the American drug industry has laid off tens of thousands of workers in this country.

And so let's close by returning to that family. The gentleman may have a family in his district, a Jones family. Mr. Jones worked for one of those big multinational corporations that have a P.O. box in Bermuda to escape their fair share of taxes at home. Mr. Jones thought that that tax break to that big company was going to save his job. The company got the tax breaks. He got a pink slip.

Now, if that's not bad enough, the gentleman would propose that Mr. Jones, when he goes on the highway to try and find another job, that he's less safe; that Mrs. Jones, who's working at the Wal-Mart, when she straps her daughter into a car seat, that that car seat be less safe because of the cuts to those programs; if the Joneses have enough money to scrimp and save and maybe visit their parents or grandparents in another State, that they wait even longer to get on the plane, and that the plane not have the inspection as quickly as it needs to; and that if Mr. Jones' and Mrs. Jones' parents or grandparents want to have a decent roof over their heads, that they have to wait longer, in fact may not even qualify, because of the cuts in housing assistance for the elderly and the disabled.

The difference between us is that we want to invest in the American family, and the other side, not everybody on the other side, Republicans and Democrats alike, on a bipartisan basis, passed this bill to invest in the American family.

The sponsor of this amendment wants to continue giving giveaways to the richest special interests. We believe those funds are better spent with the American family.

That's what this is about, and that's why I'm so proud that Republicans and Democrats alike supported this bill in the Appropriations Committee and will defeat this amendment when it comes to the floor later.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$507,767,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair, and I thank the leadership for the opportunity to bring this amendment forward.

This amendment is a very simple amendment. It's an amendment that has come to be known as the Hefley amendment, or at least came to be known as the Hefley amendment, a former Member of this body who offered an amendment to decrease appropriations bills by 1 percent in an effort to begin fiscal responsibility.

And it's my privilege to bring these amendments to the floor again in an effort to take that first step, take that first step to begin fiscal responsibility in this Chamber.

This is a good debate. It's a good debate that we have when we talk about how to spend hard-earned taxpayer money, because, Mr. Chairman, as you know, oftentimes in this Chamber, in fact, we've heard on some of these appropriations bills Members talk about their money, about my money. And it's always important that we remember whose money it is. It's not government money. It's not our money. It's the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

So this amendment is very simple. It simply says that we ought to reduce by 1 percent the amount of money being spent in this particular appropriations bill. And to be clear, that is still a significant increase in spending over last year, but it's an attempt to begin fiscal responsibility.

One of the numbers, the numbers are that last year this portion of the appropriations bill spent \$47.5 billion. The President requested an increase to \$47.9 billion for this next fiscal year, and the committee itself brings forward a bill that will spend \$50.7 billion. That's \$3.2 billion more than last year.

So this amendment would say, well, we ought not spend \$50.7 billion. Let's see if we can't get a little fiscal responsibility and instead spend \$50.2 billion.

Again, it's not as far as many of us think we ought to go in an effort to try

to be more responsible with spending the hard-earned American taxpayers' money, but it is a step in the right direction. It is a step along the line of fiscal responsibility. It is a recognition. It would be the beginning of a recognition that this is not Congress's money, that it is the money of the hardworking American taxpayer.

On many of these bills we seem to get a few more votes each time. I'm hopeful that at some point this House will make a statement, that this House will make a statement and say, yes, we do believe that, in fact, moving forward under the banner of fiscal responsibility dictates that we respect the hard work of the American taxpayer and, in fact, accept one of these amendments as we move forward.

So with that I think it's a common-sense amendment. It's a problem-solving amendment. It's an amendment that speaks to what the American family would do when they have some fiscal challenges, and that is to overall reduce the amount of money that they spend.

So, with that, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague Dr. PRICE for offering this amendment. Certainly the American people can relate to this amendment. It simply says that we will not spend 1 percent of the bill as currently written, 1 percent. Well, that equates to \$500 million, a substantial sum of money even in the context of the Federal budget.

What we have in Washington, D.C., is a spending problem. We don't have a problem with income to government. The government will receive about \$2.7 trillion this year on a Federal budget that actually spends \$2.9 trillion.

□ 1915

What is absolutely fascinating about this is that there are only two countries on Earth with whole economies that are larger than the Federal Government here in Washington, D.C., and that is the governments of Germany and Japan. When we talk about China and the growing threat of China's economy, well, look at the size of the Chinese economy. The whole economy of China is \$1.9 trillion. What we have here in Washington D.C. is certainly a spending problem.

What this amendment proposed by Dr. PRICE says is that we should be able to slip off just a little bit of that spending, just a little bit, show the American taxpayers that we can tighten the